

**R E M A R K S**

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

**THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1, 8 and 12 have been amended to even more clearly recite that the printer is caused not to print an image based on the delivery confirmation mail, if the determining section has determined that the delivery confirmation mail notifies the delivery success.

No new matter has been added and no new issues have been raised which require further consideration on the merits and/or a new search. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the amendments to the claims be approved and entered under 37 CFR 1.116.

**THE PRIOR ART REJECTION**

Claims 1-3, 8 and 10-14 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by USP 6,618,749 (previously cited "Saito et al"). This rejection, however, is again respectfully traversed.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner refers to the failure mail and delivery status notification mail disclosed by Saito et al, and the Examiner argues that image data printed due to failure mail includes the entire original document, whereas

image data printed due to delivery status notification mail includes only a part of the original document. These statements, however, are not supported by the disclosure of Saito et al.

In particular, it is respectfully pointed out that Saito et al shows the pages output in response to failure mail and delivery status notification mail in Figs. 6 and 8, respectively. As explained at column 5, lines 42-47 and column 6, lines 42-47, and as shown in Figs. 6 and 8, the outputs in response to the failure mail and the delivery status notification mail are essentially the same, except that the failure mail output includes error information, whereas the delivery status notification mail output includes information on success/failure of delivery. In both cases, the information of the original document is edited to fit on one page. See column 5, lines 43-45 with respect to failure mail ("It saves recording paper by editing the error information and the original document on one page and outputting it."), and see column 6, lines 44-46 with respect to delivery status notification mail ("Editing the information on the success/failure of delivery and the original document on one page and outputting it will prevent a waste of recording paper.").

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's assertions in the "Response to Arguments" on page 2 of the Office Action are contradicted by the cited reference.

It is respectfully pointed out, moreover, that although the Examiner continues to assert that the failure mail of Saito et al corresponds to the delivery confirmation mail of the claimed present invention, Saito et al explicitly discloses that failure mail "notifies error information to sender by E-mail" (column 1, lines 30-31). By contrast, according to the claimed present invention, the delivery confirmation mail positively notifies whether delivery of the image data has succeeded or failed. And it is respectfully pointed out that Saito et al discloses a different type of mail from the failure mail that is used to notify "success/failure" of delivery - namely the delivery status notification mail (column 1, lines 37-42). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's references to the failure mail of Saito et al as corresponding to the delivery confirmation mail of the claimed present invention are not correct.

It is respectfully submitted, moreover, that Saito et al does not even remotely suggest causes a printer to print an image based on delivery confirmation mail, only if the determining section has determined that the delivery confirmation mail notifies the delivery failure, and causing the printer not to print an image based on the delivery confirmation mail if the determining section has determined that the delivery confirmation

mail notifies the delivery success, as now more positively recited in amended independent claims 1, 8 and 12.

More specifically, in Saito et al, the failure mail does not positively notify success, and therefore Saito et al does not disclose, teach or suggest causing a printer not to print an image when delivery confirmation mail is received that notifies of delivery success. In addition, in Saito et al, when the delivery status notification mail is received, which contains information on success or failure, information on "success/failure" of the delivery and image information from the originally sent document is extracted, edited to fit one page, and then printed, regardless of whether success or failure is indicated by the delivery status notification mail.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Saito et al clearly does not disclose, teach or suggest receiving a delivery confirmation mail that notifies delivery success, and causing a printer not to print an image based on the received delivery confirmation mail, in the manner of the claimed present invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited in amended independent claims 1, 8 and 12, and claims 2-3, 10-11 and 13-14 respectively depending therefrom, clearly patentably distinguishes over Saito et al, taken singly or in combination with any of the other prior art

references of record, under 35 USC 102 as well as under 35 USC 103.

\* \* \* \* \*

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz  
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.  
220 Fifth Avenue - 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10001-7708  
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900  
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH:iv